



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/088,727	06/02/1998	MICHAEL FRY	36-1227	2084

7590

12/04/2002

NIXON & VANDERHYE
8TH FLOOR
1100 NORTH GLEBE ROAD
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

KANG, PAUL H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

26

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/088,727

Applicant(s)

FRY ET AL.

Examiner

Paul H Kang

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 9 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Art Unit: 2142

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-8, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katseff et al., US Pat. No. 6,075,796 in view of Gramlich, US Pat. No. 5,826,025.

3. As to claims 1, 6, and 11, Katseff discloses:

a World Wide Web (WWW) server, a client computer, and at least one dynamic proxy server computer (figure 4 and col. 1, line 16 – col. 2, line 55),

said dynamic proxy server computer being located in a computer network such that it is in a communications route intermediate a server computer and a client computer (figure 4, POP 84),

the dynamic proxy server computer being configured to receive data transmitted in a first data format from said server computer, to transform received data to a second data format from said first data format without substantially changing the information content of said data and to transmit the transformed said data to the client computer in said second data format (col. 2, line 19-51 and col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 55).

However, Katseff does not explicitly teach said dynamic proxy server computer being configured to run a program for transforming data, which program is referred to by an address

within a data store connected to the computer network from where the computer program is available for downloading by server computers connected to the computer network.

In the same field of endeavor, Gramlich teaches a system using multiple servers to employ a remote program for annotating, filtering and transforming data (Gramlich, col. 2, lines 20-63 and col. 5, line 17 – col. 6, line 57). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the remote program of Gramlich into the transformation system of Katseff for the purpose of increasing the efficiency by distributing tasks.

4. As to claims 2 and 8, Katseff teaches a system wherein said data is transmitted from the first server computer to the second server computer using a first transport protocol (UDP) and the transformed data is transmitted from the second server computer to the client using a second transport protocol (TCP) (col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 55).

5. As to claims 4 and 7, Katseff teaches the transforming performed by the dynamic proxy server computer is determined by the content of a protocol downloaded from a third server computer (col. 5, line 62 – col. 7, line 29).

6. As to claim 5 and 10, Katseff discloses a system wherein said first server computer is a WWW server (abstract and figure 4).

Art Unit: 2142

7. Claims 3 and 9 are allowed.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 4-8, and 10-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicants argue that the prior art of record does not teach a second server computer which runs a program for transforming data. The new grounds of rejection teaches this feature.

Applicant's arguments filed September 19, 2002 (paper no. 25) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argued in substance that the prior art of record does not teach a system using multiple servers to employ a remote program for annotating, filtering and transforming data. "In fact, what is disclosed in Gramlich is one server (the proxy server 130) running one program (the AOP 114) which includes a number of sub-routines (such as insert, delete, Run_Program), each of which is hardcoded into AOP 114.

In response to Applicant's argument above that the prior art of record fails to teach multiple servers to employ a remote program to transform data, the Examiner respectfully disagree. The system taught by Katseff-Gramlich disclose multiple AOP's which act like any other firewalls (See Gramlich, Abstract, Summary, col. 5, line 18 – col. 6, line 57). Additionally, annotations are performed dynamically, based on specific document requests and various sources, ranging from multiple AOP's or other web servers (See also Gramlich, col. 13, line 50 – col. 14, line 18).

Art Unit: 2142

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2142

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul H Kang whose telephone number is (703) 308-6123. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hour flex. First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell can be reached on (703) 305-9703. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


Paul H Kang
Examiner
Art Unit 2142

KENNETH R. COULTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER


December 2, 2002